

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed February 3, 2006. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-28 were pending in this Application. Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-28 were rejected.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 19-20, and 26-28 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,937,822 issued to Daniel O. Weddle et al. ("Weddle"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art does not teach all of the elements of the claimed embodiment of the invention.

Claims 1 and 10 are the remaining independent claims. These claims have been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 5 and 14, respectively. Because Claims 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, they are discussed below in connection with those rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 14, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weddle as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,535,237 issued to Leonard J. LaPadula, III et al. ("LaPadula") Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art combinations, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious.

The recitations of Claims 5 and 14 have been incorporated into Claims 1 and 10, respectively. Claim 21 is cancelled.

The Examiner relies on the teachings of LaPadula to supply the teaching that the external reference signal can be derived from a double sideband residual carrier (DSB-RC) signal. However, the use of this type of signal is not taught or suggested by LaPadula.

LaPadula is directed to GPS signal processing. It mentions only that a GPS signal may be a double sideband signal (Col. 1, lines 65-67). At most, LaPadula suggests that a GPS signal may be used as a reference for GPS transmissions. This is, at most, a suggestion that the GPS system might have an internal reference signal.

LaPadula does not teach or suggest using a double sideband signal as a external reference signal, that is, a signal that is “external” to another communications network.

Furthermore, LaPadula does not teach or suggest deriving the synchronization signal from an external reference signal that is not intended as a reference (synchronization) signal.

For this reason, the combination of Webbler and LaPadula does not teach or suggest the inventions of Claims 1 and 10. These claims and their independent claims are allowable.

New Claims 29 - 34

Claim 29 is supported by Figure 2 and the accompanying text on page 15, lines 5 - 20.

Claims 30 - 33 are supported on page 10, line 20, through page 11, line 2.

Claim 34 is supported throughout the Detailed Description, which emphasizes that the external reference is for both time and frequency synchronization.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims.

Applicants enclose a Petition for Two Month Extension of Time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the \$225.00 extension fee to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P. Applicants believe there are no additional fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2634.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Ann C. Livingston
Reg. No. 32,479

Date: July 3, 2006

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **31625**
512.322.2634
512.322.8383 (fax)